

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-504001/P11796

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. Claim amendments are presented herein to obviate the current rejection. No new matter has been added.

Specification

The title of the application has been amended to "DETERMINING SOURCES OF UNWANTED NETWORK COMMUNICATIONS". It is respectfully submitted that this title is descriptive of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this basis for objection be withdrawn.

35 USC § 102

Claims 1-34 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Eichstaedt. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The office action takes the position that as spiders or webcrawlers make requests through client machines for information from a server, the skilled artisan would consider these client machines as network points in the network as well as interface devices. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the differences between the subject matter of claim 1 and

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-504001/P11796

Eichstaedt. Claim 1 states that the unwanted communications passing through first and second points are from a source and are directed to a target device (for support, see, inter alia, specification FIG. 4). Claims 20, 31, and 33 have also been amended in a similar fashion.

Eichstaedt discloses an arrangement in which one of two embodiments may be utilized. In a "first main embodiment", a system monitors a frequency at which a client initiates requests based on a specific client identifier and by using previous log entries for the client (see, inter alia, col. 7, lines 3-22). In a second main embodiment, the system monitors an accumulated amount of data requested by a client (see, inter alia, Eichstaedt col. 8, lines 34-38). Neither of these embodiments disclose an arrangement in which information is generated based on two points through which unwanted communications pass through as recited in claim 1. Such an arrangement would require that unwanted communications pass through two clients and that information would be generated by both such clients relating to the unwanted communications. Moreover, there is no provision within Eichstaedt to provide log entries for such an arrangement and to associate log entries for two clients in order to determine which of the two clients first carried unwanted communications.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-504001/P11796

Accordingly, claims 1, 20, 21, and 33 and their respective dependent claims should be allowable.

Claim 12 has been amended to recite: "monitoring communications passing through at least a first point and second point on a path from a source sub-network to a target device; analyzing the communications passing through the first and second points for indicia of unwanted communications; identifying the source sub-network as originating unwanted communications that are adapted to reduce the ability of a target device on a network to respond to other communications, the source sub-network connected to the network through an interface device associated with the first of the at least a first point and second point that carried the unwanted communications." Similar to claim 1, claim 12 provides an arrangement in which communications passing through at least a first point and a second point on a path are monitored. As stated above, Eichstaedt does not disclose such an arrangement.

Accordingly, claim 12 and its respective dependent claims should be allowable.

Claim 24 has been amended to recite "a plurality of interface monitors between the first network and the second network for monitoring the passage of unwanted messages therethrough; a localizer coupled to the plurality of interface monitors to identify the network point that first carried the

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-504001/P11796

unwanted messages". Since Eichstaedt fails to disclose monitoring the passage as described above, it also fails to disclose a plurality of monitors as well as a localizer to identify a network point that first carrier that first carried the unwanted messages.

Accordingly, claim 24 and its dependent claims should be allowable.

Concluding Comments

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.


BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-504001/P11796

Applicant asks that all claims be allowed. Please apply
any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/8/05


Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030
Attorney for Intel Corporation

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer Number: 20985
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, CA 92130
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099
10528762.doc

BEST AVAILABLE COPY